

Panaji, 16th January, 2025 (Pausa 26, 1946)

SERIES II No. 42

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

Note:- There are four Extraordinary issues to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 41 dated 09-01-2025 as follows:

- (1) *Extraordinary dated 09-01-2025 from pages 853 to 854 regarding Circular from Department of Finance.*
- (2) *Extraordinary (No. 2) dated 13-01-2025 from pages 855 to 866 regarding Circulars from Department of Finance.*
- (3) *Extraordinary (No. 3) dated 14-01-2025 from pages 867 to 868 regarding Orders and Notification from Goa State Election Commission.*
- (4) *Extraordinary (No. 4) dated 15-01-2025 from pages 869 to 872 regarding Notifications from Goa State Election Commission.*

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

Department of Animal Husbandry

Directorate of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services

Notification

No. 4-1(10)/TaskForce/2024-25/6108

In pursuance of the directions of the Government of India, Ministry of Fisheries, Animal Husbandry & Dairying vide D.O. letter No. R-24018/26/2023-DIRANLM (E25776) advising all the State to constitute the Task Force on fodder development, the Government is pleased to constitute a Task Force on Fodder Development in the State with its objective to see that more area is covered under fodder development. The Task Force on Fodder Development in the State of Goa is constituted with the following member:

1. Director of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services — Chairman.
2. Director, ICAR-CCARI, Ela, Old Goa, Goa — Member.
3. Director of Agriculture, Caranzalem, Goa — Member.
4. Director of Rural Development Agency — Member.

5. Deputy Director (Gyn), Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services — Member.
6. Deputy Director (CSS), Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services — Nodal Officer.
7. Deputy Conservator of Forest Department (Research) — Member.
8. Programme Co-ordinator of KVK, North Goa — Member.
9. Programme Co-ordinator of KVK, South Goa — Member.
10. Project Director, ATMA, North Goa — Member.
11. Project Director, ATMA, South Goa — Member.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Dr. Nitin Naik, Director (AH & VS) & ex officio Joint Secretary.

Panaji, 18th December, 2024.

Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs

Order

No. DCS/EST/Appt.PIO/TALUKA/2024-25/2816

Read: 1. Order No. DCS/EST/1-90/R.Inf.Act/2005/198 dated 08-12-2005.

2. Order No. DCS/EST/Appt.PIO/TALUKA/2018-19/442 dated 31-01-2019.

In exercise of powers conferred under Section 5 of Right to Information Act, 2005 and in supersession

of all the earlier Orders on the subject, the Government of Goa is pleased to designate following Officials as Public Information Officer/Assistant Public Information Officer & First Appellate Authority at Head Office and Taluka Civil Supplies Offices, Department of Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, with immediate effect.

Sr. No.	Name of Office	Name of Public Information Officer	Name of Assistant Public Information Officer	First Appellate Authority
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Department of Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs (Head Office)	Deputy Director of Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs	Assistant Director (HQ-II), Department of Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs	Director, Department of Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs.
2.	All Taluka Offices of Department of Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs	Inspector in-charge (CS)	Senior most Sub-Inspector	Assistant Director of Civil Supplies at Taluka Offices.

This issues with the approval of the Government.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Jayant G. Tari, Director (Civil Supplies & Consumer Affairs) & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Panaji, 6th January, 2025.



Department of Co-operation
Office of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies

Notification

No. 08/02/2024-25/Wing-I/HQ/RCS/3360

In exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 8 of the Goa Co-operative Societies Act, 2001, "The Hirkani MCLF Co-operative Multipurpose Society Ltd.", C/o Resh Rajas Sanguelekar, H. No. 82/1, Rai Wado, Marna Siolim-Goa is registered under code symbol No. RCSZ2024250004.

Arvind Bugde, Registrar (Co-operative Societies).

Panaji, 24th December, 2024.

Certificate of Registration

"The Hirkani MCLF Co-operative Multipurpose Society Ltd.", C/o Resh Rajas Sanguelekar, H. No. 82/1, Rai Wado, Marna Siolim-Goa has been registered on 23-12-2024 and its bears registration code symbol No. RCSZ2024250004 and its classified as General Society under sub-classification No. 12-(e)-Self Help Group in terms of Rule 8 of the Goa Co-operative Rules, 2003.

Arvind Bugde, Registrar (Co-operative Societies).

Panaji, 24th December, 2024.

Department of Education
Directorate of Higher Education

Order

No. DHE/ADMN/168/WA-NMV-Inter-Co-Ord./2024/7583

Sanction of the Government is hereby accorded for availing the services on working arrangement basis of Mr. Nikhil M. Varerkar, Associate Professor at Dempo College of Commerce and Economics, Cujira, Bambolim, Goa as Internship Co-ordinator in Directorate of Higher Education as a stopgap arrangement.

Mr. Nikhil M. Varerkar shall draw his salary as Associate Professor at Dempo College of Commerce and Economics, Cujira, Bambolim, Goa and his working arrangement shall be a temporary measure until the post is filled on regular basis.

The Principal of Dempo College of Commerce and Economics, Cujira, Bambolim, Goa shall relieve Mr. Nikhil M. Varerkar, Associate Professor with immediate effect.

This issues with the approval of the Government.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Sanjana D. Bandekar, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Porvorim, 30th December, 2024.

Department of Environment & Climate Change

Order

No. 76/4/2010/ENV & CC/DIR/Part/1829

Sub.: State Oil Spill Crisis Management Group (SOS-CMG).

Ref.:1) National Oil Spill Disaster Contingency Plan (NOSDCP-2015).

2) Goa State Oil Spill Disaster Contingency Plan (Goa SOS-DCP).

The State of Goa, through the Department of Environment & Climate Change, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 3 (3) of the Environment Protection Act, 1986, hereby constitutes the State Oil Spill Crisis Management Group (SOS-CMG) under the Chairmanship of Chief Secretary, Government of Goa.

State Oil Spill Crisis Management Group (SOS-CMG)

Sr. No.	Members	Designation
1	2	3
1.	Chief Secretary	Chairperson.
2.	Secretary (Finance)	Member.
3.	Secretary (Labour and Employment)	Member.
4.	Secretary (Environment)	Member.
5.	Secretary (Health)	Member.
6.	Secretary (Industries, Trade and Commerce)	Member.
7.	Secretary (Public Works Department)	Member.
8.	Secretary (Tourism)	Member.
9.	Secretary (Water Resources)	Member.
10.	Secretary (Fisheries)	Member.
11.	Secretary (Transport)	Member.
12.	Secretary (Panchayats)	Member.
13.	Secretary (Urban Development)	Member.
14.	Indian Coast Guard-(W) DIG or above	Member.
15.	Secretary (Revenue)	Member.
16.	Secretary (Home)	Member.
17.	Principal Chief Conservator of Forests	Member.
18.	Director General of Police	Member.
19.	Director, Civil Defence	Member.
20.	Director, Directorate of Transport	Member.
21.	Director, Directorate of Health Services	Member.
22.	Director, Department of Animal Husbandry & Veterinary Services	Member.
23.	Director, Department of Environment & Climate Change	Member.
24.	Director, Department of Science, Technology & Waste Management	Member.
25.	Director, National Institute of Oceanography	Member.
26.	Vice Chancellor, Goa University	Member.

1	2	3
27.	Director, National Disaster Management Authority	Member.
28.	Chairperson, Mormugao Port Authority	Member.
29.	Captain of Ports, Department of Ports	Member.
30.	Director, River Navigation Department	Member.
31.	Chief Inspector, Inspectorate of Factories & Boilers	Member.
32.	Director, Directorate of Fire & Emergency Services	Member.
33.	Chairman, Goa State Pollution Control Board	Member.
34.	The Principal, Maritime School, c/o Captain of Ports	Member.
35.	Director General, Goa Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Expert Member.
36.	Factory Manager, M/s. Omni Impex Pvt. Ltd.	Expert Member.
37.	Associate Director (HSE), M/s. Deccan Fine Chemicals (I) Pvt. Ltd.	Expert Member.
38.	Chief Manufacturing Officer & Unit Head, M/s Paradeep Phosphates Pvt. Ltd.	Expert Member.
39.	Chief Executive Officer, M/s Zuari IAV Pvt. Ltd., Oil Terminal	Expert Member.
40.	Member Secretary, Goa State Pollution Control Board	Member Secretary.

The Terms of Reference for the State Oil Spill Crisis Management Group (SOS-CMG) are as follows:

1. Facilitate State's preparedness and response to oil spill incidents and further effectively implement and execute the mandate of the Goa-SOS-DCP.
2. Address issues related to oil spill management during, prior to and post oil spills.
3. Provide guidance, assistance or advice useful in performing any of the stakeholder functions.
4. Assist the State Government in managing oil pollution incident at a site in the State.
5. Meet atleast once in six months, record minutes with issues discussed, action plan for the same, responsibility and target dates for implementation and last status update and forward a copy of the same to the Central Co-ordinating Authority, DIG (Environment), Indian Coast Guard.
6. Can co-opt any person whose assistance or advice is considered useful in performing any of its functions, to participate in the deliberations of any of its meetings.
7. Review the planning standards of GOA SOS-DCP at five-year intervals to ensure:
 - i. The maintenance of best achievable practices to respond to a worst-case spill provide for.
 - ii. Continuous operation of oil spill response activities to the maximum extent practicable and without jeopardizing safety and environment.
 - iii. Practices are updated to include proven new response technologies and response processes in interaction with concerned interested parties prevention credits to support an alternative worst case discharge volume for the contingency plan.
8. Review the progress report submitted by the District Crisis Management Groups.
9. Respond to queries addressed to it by the District Crisis Management Groups.
10. Publish a list of experts and officials in the State who are concerned with the management of oil pollution incidents.

All the non-official members of the Committee shall be entitled for Honorarium of Rs. 3500/- per member per sitting which will be borne by the Department of Environment & Climate Change, Government of Goa.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Johnson B. Fernandes, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Environment & Climate Change).

Panaji, 3rd January, 2025.

Department of Housing

Goa Housing Board

Order

No. GHB/ADM/1018/2024

In exercise of the powers conferred by regulation 3 of the Goa Housing Board (Appointment and functions of Technical Committee) Regulations, 2012, the Goa Housing Board, with the prior approval of the Government conveyed vide letter No. 2/3/2015/HSG/17 dated 23-09-2024, hereby re-constitutes the Technical Committee consisting of the following members, namely:-

1. Chairman of the Goa Housing Board — Chairman.
2. Secretary-cum-Managing Director of Goa Housing Board — Member.
3. Superintendent Engineer, Circle Officer-II, Public Works Department, North Goa District — Member.
4. Shri Devendra Digambar Prabhu, Architect — Member.
5. Shri Shivraj Nauso Arolkar, Structural Consultant — Member.
6. Housing Engineer, Goa Housing Board — Member Secretary.

This order shall be deemed to have come into effect from the date of Government approval i.e. w.e.f. 23-09-2024.

Sd/-, Managing Director.

Porvorim, 30th September, 2024.

Department of Labour

Order

No. 28/54/2024-LAB/8

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Santosh Sadekar, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Santosh Sadekar, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/53/2024-LAB/9

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Sunraj Talaulikar, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Sunraj Talaulikar, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/48/2024-LAB/10

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Shri Mahadev Patil, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Shri Mahadev Patil, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).
Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/57/2024-LAB/11

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Venkat M. Kankatte, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Venkat M. Kankatte, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).
Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/51/2024-LAB/12

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa and it's workman, Mr. Akshay Pednekar, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machine Private Limited, Plot No. N4, Phase 4, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Salcete, Goa, in dismissing, Mr. Akshay Pednekar, with effect from 14-08-2023, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).
Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/73/2024-LAB/15

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Chowgule Industries Private Limited, Campal, Panaji-Goa and it's workman, Shri Shantaram A. Raul, Store Executive/Store Clerk, represented by the Gomantak Mazdoor Sangh, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Chowgule Industries Private Limited, Campal, Panaji-Goa, in dismissing, Shri Shantaram A. Raul, Store Executive/Store Clerk, vide their Order dated 02-05-2023, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/74/2024-LAB/23

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Netzech Technologies India Private Limited, L-10, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Goa and it's workman, Shri Dakshak Waingankar, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14

of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Netzech Technologies India Private Limited, L-10, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Goa in dismissing, Shri Dakshak Waingankar, Technician, with effect from 21-02-2024, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 3rd January, 2025.

Order

No. 28/75/2024-LAB/24

Whereas, the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Netzech Technologies India Private Limited, L-10, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Goa and it's workman, Shri Sadashiv Dalvi, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto;

And whereas, the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court-II of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the action of management of M/s. Netzech Technologies India Private Limited, L-10, Verna Industrial Estate, Verna, Goa, in dismissing, Shri Sadashiv Dalvi, Technician, with effect from 21-04-2024, is legal and justified?
- (2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 3rd January, 2025.

Notification

No. 28/02/2024-LAB/Part-II/759

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 25-11-2024 in Case No. IT/03/2001 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 18th December, 2024.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND
LABOUR COURT
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before Mrs. Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar, Hon'ble
Presiding Officer)

Case No. IT/03/2001

Shri Rohidas Naik,
Rep. by Mumbai Mazdoor Sabha,
Saidham, Dhavalimol, Kavlem,
Ponda-Goa Workman/Party-I.

V/s

M/s M. R. F. Limited,
Tisk, Usgao,
Ponda-Goa Employer/Party II.

Workman/Party I represented by Learned Adv. Ms. S. Narvekar.

Employer/Party II represented by Adv. Shri S. B. Karpe.

AWARD

(Delivered on this the 25th day of the month of
November of the year 2024)

By Order dated 3rd January, 2001 bearing No. IRM/CON/PONDA/(287)/2000/78, the Government of Goa in exercise of powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short 'The Act'), has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

"(1) Whether the action of the management of M/s MRF Limited, Usgao, Ponda, Goa, in awarding punishment to Shri Rohidas Naik of six days suspension from work on 2-9-99, from 26-11-1999 to 27-11-1999 and from 30-12-1999 to 1-1-2000 without wages, is legal and justified?

(2) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. Upon receipt of the reference, it was registered as IT/03/2001 and registered A/D notices were issued to both the Parties. Pursuant to service of notice, Party I filed his Claim Statement at Exhibit 3.

3. In brief, the case of the Workman/Party I is that the Workman/Party I is employed in the establishment of the Employer/Party II, M/s MRF Ltd., a Company incorporated under Company Act, 1956 having their factory at Usgao, Ponda-Goa. The Company is engaged in the manufacturing of tyres. Workman/Party I is the member of the Union formed by the Employees of the Employer/Party II. That since the formation of the said Union, there has been harassment and victimization to the office bearers of the Union as well as the members on account of their legitimate trade union activities.

4. It is further alleged that the present illegal punitive warnings and suspension of the Union's active member Mr. Rohidas Naik by letter dated 23-06-1999, 25-08-1999, 19-11-1999 and 27-12-1999 on which dates he was the President of the Goa MRF Employees' Union amounts to harassment and unfair labour practice. It is further stated that by an illegal show-cause notice dated 04-05-1999, the Company alleged that the Party I had remained unauthorisedly absent during certain days in the months of November, 1998 to March, 1999 for which only 48 hours were given to the Party I to reply to the same which was prejudicial to him. It is stated that Party I sought time to submit his reply but before any reply could be submitted, by a letter dated 23-06-1999, the Party II illegally imposed a punishment by way of warning on the Party I and neither any documents sought by the Party I to prepare his reply were furnished to him nor was he given an opportunity to file his reply.

5. Party I further stated that the Party II issued another illegal show-cause notice dated 09-08-1999 alleging unauthorized absence for certain days during April, 1999 to June, 1999 and once again only 48 hours were given to file the reply. Party I was forced to seek time of 10 days to file his reply, which was in fact filed on 24-08-1999. In the detailed reply, the Party I sought copies of his Leave Card, which was in possession of the Management which request was refused by the Party II thereby prejudicing the Workman's defence. The Party I stated that he had explained his absence on the ground that he had applied for leave without pay for most of the days due to Union work and had also requested the Party II to assign him work in Shift I and II only as was being done for office bearers of the other Union which request was also refused by Party II.

6. It is further alleged that the Party II illegally imposed one day suspension by way of punishment on the Party I who lost his wages for that day as also all the benefits that would accrue to him and no enquiry was held nor were any documents requested by him were furnished to him. By letter dated 06-09-1999, the Party I had informed the Party II that he had to remain present at the High Court for hearing of a Writ Petition filed by the Union against the Party II to enforce a paid holiday which request was refused by the Party II.

7. By another illegal show-cause notice dated 03-11-1999, the Party II alleged unauthorized absence of the Workman during July to October, 1999. The Party I sought time of 8 days on 05-11-1999 as only 48 hours were given to him to file the reply and further 8 days' time was sought on 15-11-1999 which was refused by the Party II and an illegal order of 2 days' suspension as punishment was imposed on the Party I/Workman. The Party I was not given opportunity to reply to the Show-Cause Notice nor was given any documents requested by him and no enquiry was held into the alleged misconduct before imposing the punishment. A detailed reply dated 04-12-1999 was filed by the Party I/Workman despite which the Party II did not withdraw the illegal order of suspension.

8. The Party I states that by a letter dated 11-12-1999, the Party II issued a Show-Cause Notice which the Party I received on 13-12-1999 alleging the absence of Party I in the months of November and December, 1999 on the dates mentioned therein constituting gross-misconduct under Item No. XXV & VII of Clause-4 of the Certified Standing Orders. Thereafter, by letter dated 27-12-1999, the Party I was served with the Order of Suspension by way of punishment interactive on the ground that the request for 15 days' time to reply to the show-cause notice was not justified. It is submitted that the said punitive suspensions imposed on the Party I are illegal and the show-cause notice issued against the Party I was ex-facie illegal and untenable at law as the Party I was not allowed even a reasonable opportunity of showing cause to the show-cause notices dated 04-05-1999, 09-08-1999, 03-11-1999 and 11-12-1999. The Party I states that there was indeed no enquiry before the imposition of the punitive suspension as the warning and the punitive suspensions have been imposed by the Party II only to victimize the Party I for his legitimate trade union activities.

9. The Party I stated that since the suspension was clearly illegal, the Union, Mumbai Mazdoor Sabha, a Trade Union of which the Party I is a member, forwarded a letter dated 14-01-2000 to the Party II with the following demand:

"We demand that the show cause notices dated 04-05-1999, 09-08-1999, 03-11-1999, 11-12-1999 and letters imposing punishment by way of warning and suspension dated 23-06-1999, 25-08-1999, 19-11-1999 and 27-12-1999 be withdrawn/cancelled/revoked with full wages for the period of suspension and continuity of service. We further demand that Mr. Rohidas Naik (T. No. 752) be given compensation amounting to two days' wages for every one day of enforced unemployment in view of the mental torture caused to Mr. Rohidas Naik and his family".

10. The Party I stated that since the demand letter was not replied by the Party II, by letter dated 24-02-2000, the said Union was constrained on behalf of the Party I/Workman to approach the Office of the Labour Commissioner to take the matter for conciliation. The said Union also submitted a Justification Statement along with the letter dated 24-02-2000. The conciliation proceedings ended in failure as not only did the Party II by its Justification Statement dated 04-08-2000 denied that the Party I was entitled to any relief but also called upon the Conciliation Officer to treat the matter as closed.

11. It is the case as pleaded by the Party II in the Written Statement at Exh. 4 that the Party I/Workman was employed with the Party II Company. It is submitted that the Party I was absenting from work unauthorisedly and without leave or any intimation which constituted serious acts of misconduct under the Certified Standing Orders. The Party II submitted that Party I was issued warning letter dated 09-07-1997 wherein he was advised to improve his attendance in future as far as his unauthorised absenteeism was concerned in the months of April, May and June for the year, 1997.

12. The Party II states that the Party I was found remaining unauthorisedly absent without leave or intimation during the months of Nov'98 (6 days), December'98 (8 days), Jan'99 (9 days), Feb'99 (7 days) and March'99 (7 days) and was served with a show-cause notice dated 04-05-1999 and instead of replying to the said show-cause notice, the Party I sought further time to reply to the said show-cause notice by his letter dated 17-05-1999. The Party II submitted that the Party I was avoiding showing cause in a matter of his unauthorised absence from work in an attempt to delay the proceedings. The Party II submitted that after considering the nature of the misconduct and the request for further time, awarded a lighter punishment of a warning by way of punishment vide their letter dated 23-06-1999 and the Party I was once again advised to be regular at work in future.

13. The Party II submitted that despite being advised to be regular at work, the Party I/Workman continued to remain unauthorisedly absent from work without leave or intimation during the months of April, 1999 (6 days), May '99 (11 days) and June '99 (7 days) and was served with a show-cause notice dated 09-08-1999. The Party I/Workman replied to the show cause notice vide his reply dated 24-09-1999 which reply was not satisfactory in nature. However, once again the Party II on considering the reply, treated the matter in a lenient manner and imposed a lighter punishment on the workman by awarding a single days' suspension by way of punishment vide their Order dated 25-08-1999.

14. The Party II submitted that despite the earlier warning letter, show-cause notices and subsequent order of punishment, the Party I/Workman continued to commit similar acts of misconduct and remained unauthorisedly absent from work during the months of July, 1999 (10 days), Aug '99 (3 days), Sept '99 (2 days), and Oct '99 (3 days) for which the Party II was constrained to issue another show-cause dated 03-11-1999 and the Party I was asked to show-cause as regards to the abovementioned absenteeism. It is submitted that once again the Party I failed to show-cause within the stipulated time and instead insisted on further 8 days' time to file the reply. The Party II after having considered the request and the seriousness of the acts of misconduct committed by the Party I/Workman and the failure to reply to the show-cause, imposed a two days' suspension to the Party I vide their Order dated 19-11-1999, once again advising the Party I/Workman to be regular at work.

15. The Party II submitted that the Party I/Workman did not heed to the advice of the Party II and continued to remain unauthorisedly absent from work without leave or intimation during the months of Nov '99 (7 days) and Dec '99 (6 days) and was once again issued another show-cause notice dated 11-12-1999 wherein he was asked to reply to the said show-cause notice. The Party I/Workman however once again failed to show-cause as required and instead sought further 15 days' time to reply to the show-cause notice. The Party II once again after considering the request of the Party I/Workman came to the conclusion that the extension of time sought by the Party I was unjustified and uncalled for and submitted that the Party I/Workman was a habitual absentee from work which is evident from his attendance record whereby once again the Party I/Workman was shown leniency by the Party II and let off with a 3 days' suspension from work without wages.

16. The Party II stated that the Party I/Workman was remaining unauthorisedly absent from work and continued to do so despite repeated advice by the Party II from time to time whereby he was advised to improve his attendance in his own interest. The Party II submitted that the Party I/Workman was given several opportunities to improve his attendance which continued to deteriorate over a period of time causing disruption of normal work which amounted to serious acts of misconduct under Item XXV & LII of Clause-21 of the Certified Standing Order of the Company which in fact warranted strict disciplinary action against the Party I. It is submitted that having concluded each time that the acts so committed by the Party I/Workman were serious in nature, modified the quantum of punishment imposed on the Party I/Workman and the same was in accordance with the provisions of the Certified Standing Orders of the Company and as per law.

17. The Party II in their Written Statement specifically denied the explanation and the justification given by Party I/Workman with reference to his alleged illegal absenteeism and submitted that the Party I is not entitled for any relief as claimed in the Claim Statement.

18. In the Rejoinder filed by Party I all the averments in the Written Statement of Party II have been specifically denied. Party I maintained and reiterated all the facts stated by him in his Statement of Claim and denied the case of the Party II and all the objections raised in respect of Statement of Claim in the Written Statement filed by Party II.

19. On completion of the pleadings, the following Issues were framed at Exhibit 6 by this Tribunal which reads as under:

ISSUES

1. Whether the Party I/Union proves that the action of the Party II/Employer in awarding punishment to Shri Rohidas Naik of six days suspension from work on 2-9-99, from 26-11-99 to 27-11-99 and from 30-12-99 to 1-1-2000 is illegal and unjustified and is an act of unfair labour practice?
2. Whether the Party II/Employer proves that the reference is not maintainable?
3. Whether Shri Rohidas Naik is entitled to any relief?
4. What Award?

20. I have gone through the records i.e. the pleadings, the oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by both the Parties, the written synopsis

filed as well as the oral arguments advanced by both the Parties and after considering the same my findings on the issues with reasons are as follows:

- Issue No. 1 & 3 : In the negative.
 Issue No. 2 : In the negative.
 Issue No. 5 : As per final order.

REASONS

21. *Issue No. 1 and 3:* It is the case of Party I/Union that the Party II issued illegal punitive warnings and suspension orders vide letter dated 23-06-1999, 25-08-1999, 19-11-1999 and 27-12-1999 to the Party I/Workman, he being the active member of the Union. According to Party I the alleged show-cause notices caused prejudice to him as the Party II illegally imposed a punishment by way of warning on the Party I/Workman and had not allowed the Party I to file its reply along with documents.

22. That the illegal show-cause notice dated 09-08-1999 alleging unauthorized absence for certain days during April, 1999 to June, 1999 again caused grave prejudice to Party I/Workman as according to Party I, he had explained his absence on the ground that he had applied for leave without pay for most of the days due to Union work and had also requested the Party II to assign him work in Shift I and II only as it was being done for office bearers of the other Union which request was also refused by Party II.

23. It is further the case of the Party I that the Party II illegally imposed one day suspension by way of punishment on him due to which he lost his wages for that day and that while doing so, the Party II did not hold any enquiry nor was he allowed to produce any documents as requested, which act of the Party II has caused prejudice to him. That by another illegal show-cause notice dated 03-11-1999, the Party II alleged unauthorized absence of the Workman during July to October, 1999 and ordered 2 days' illegal suspension by way of punishment which order of suspension and punishment has caused great prejudice to the Party I/Workman.

24. The Party I stated that by letter dated 11-12-1999, the Party II issued a Show-Cause Notice which the Party I received on 13-12-1999 alleging the absence of Party I/Workman in the months of November and December, 1999 on the dates mentioned therein constituting gross-misconduct under Item No. XXV & VII of Clause-4 of the Certified Standing Orders. Thereafter, by letter dated 27-12-1999 the Party/Workman was served with the Order of Suspension by way of punishment interactive on the ground that the request for 15 days' time to reply to the show-cause notice was not justified. It is submitted that the said punitive suspensions imposed on the Party

II are illegal and the show-cause notice issued against the Party I was ex-facie illegal and untenable at law as the Party I was not allowed even a reasonable opportunity of showing cause to the show-cause notices dated 04-05-1999, 09-08-1999, 03-11-1999 and 11-12-1999. The Party I states that there was indeed no enquiry before the imposition of the punitive suspension as the warning and the punitive suspensions have been imposed by the Party II only to victimize the Party I for his legitimate trade union activities.

25. The Party I stated that since the suspension was clearly illegal, the Union, Mumbai Mazdoor Sabha, a Trade Union of which the Party I is a member, forwarded a letter dated 14-01-2000 to the Party II with the following demand:

"We demand that the show cause notices dated 04-05-1999, 09-08-1999, 03-11-1999, 11-12-1999 and letters imposing punishment by way of warning and suspension dated 23-06-1999, 25-08-1999, 19-11-1999 and 27-12-1999 be withdrawn/cancelled/revoked with full wages for the period of suspension and continuity of service. We further demand that Mr. Rohidas Naik (T. No. 752) be given compensation amounting to two days' wages for every one day of enforced unemployment in view of the mental torture caused to Mr. Rohidas Naik and his family".

26. The Party I stated that since the demand letter was not replied by the Party II, therefore, by letter dated 24-02-2000, the said Union was constrained on behalf of the Party I/Workman to approach the Office of the Labour Commissioner to take the matter for conciliation. The said Union also submitted a Justification Statement dated 04-08-2000 along with the letter dated 24-02-2000. The conciliation proceedings ended in failure as not only did the Party II by its Justification Statement dated 04-08-2000 denied that the Party I was entitled to any relief but also called upon the Conciliation Officer to treat the matter as closed.

27. On the other hand, it is the contention of the Party II that the Workman was absenting unauthorisedly from work without leave or intimation during the above specified period for which even the Warning Letters were issued to him and he was advised not to repeat the same in future. The Workman however, continued remaining absent unauthorisedly without leave or intimation for the following period i.e. 6 days absenteeism for the month of November, 1998, 8 days absenteeism for the month of December, 1998, 9 days absenteeism for the month of January, 1999, 7 days absenteeism for the month of February, 1999, 7 days absenteeism for the month of March, 1999, for which he was again served

with the show-cause notice dated 04-09-1999. The records reveal that the Workman instead of filing reply to the said notice sought time to file his reply. Therefore, considering the conduct of the Workman and also considering his nature of avoiding to give justification for his absenteeism, the Party II awarded punishment by way of warning vide letter dated 23-06-1999 and he was advised to be regular in future.

28. The Party II has brought sufficient evidence on record to show that despite previous punishment of warnings and advises to be regular on his work, the Workman again remained absent unauthorisedly without leave or intimation for 6 days in April, 1999, 11 days in May, 1999 and 7 days in June, 1999 pursuance to which, considering the reply filed by the Workman to the show-cause notice for the above absenteeism as unsatisfactory, the Party II again took a lenient view and awarded single day suspension vide Punishment Order dated 25-08-1999.

29. The act of unauthorised absenteeism was again repeated by Party I Workman by remaining unauthorisedly absent from work for the period, 10 days of July, 1999, 3 days of August, 1999, 2 days of September, 1999 and 2 days of October, 1999. The show-cause notice issued to him dated 03-11-1999 was not replied within stipulated time and instead the Workman asked for 8 days' time to reply to the show-cause notice. This time the Management imposed 2 days' suspension vide their Order dated 19-11-1999 for the above misconduct and was also advised to be regular at work.

30. Despite repeated show-cause notices for his alleged absenteeism periodically and the subsequent punishment of suspension of 1 day and 2 days, the Workman yet again remained absent unauthorisedly at work without leave or intimation in the month of November, 1999 for 7 days and in the month of December, 1999 for 6 days for which again the show-cause notice dated 11-12-1999 was issued to the Workman. The Workman instead of filing reply again sought 15 days' time to file his reply. The Party II however felt that the extension sought by the Workman was unjustified and uncalled for and proceeded to impose punishment of 3 days suspension from work without wages. Therefore, the contention of Party II that the above acts of the Workman caused disruption of normal work besides the facts that the Workman did not pay any heed to the timely warnings given by the Party II nor could respond positively to the show-cause notices within a stipulated time despite given opportunities to do so which act of the Workman was considered to be an act of serious misconduct under Item No. XXV and LII of Clause 21 of the Certified Standing Orders which warrants strict disciplinary action.

31. It is further submitted that the Workman was a habitual absentee and had not improved his conduct despite being given reasonable opportunities. The Workman in the reference accepted that he was absent during the days as indicated in the show-cause notice dated 09-08-1999. The Party II, therefore, has reasonably and by way of legally acceptable evidence has proved that the punishment imposed on the Workman was based on the acts of unauthorised absenteeism amounting to serious misconduct on behalf of the Workman which has resulted into passing orders of suspension as discussed hereinabove. It is also brought on record that the Workman was in possession of his Leave Application Card and therefore was aware about his status of leave and other details pertaining to his Leave Application Card, however, has not taken any steps to discard the case put forth by the Party II as regards his unauthorised absenteeism.

32. The Party II for every alleged act of absenteeism has issued show-cause notice to the Workman by giving him opportunity to justify his absenteeism, however, the Workman either failed to file his reply within the given stipulated time nor could give acceptable justification for his alleged absenteeism. Therefore, it is the contention of the Party II that the punishment of suspension was proportionate to the proved acts of misconduct committed by Party I/ Workman. It is further their contention that the action taken by the Party II/Company is fair and justified in the given facts and circumstances and considering the evidence on record. The Party II/Company has also shown that the suspension imposed on Party I/ Workman was in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders of the Company and that the same has been passed after giving a reasonable opportunity to improve his attendance.

33. As regards the defence taken by the Party I/ Workman that no detailed inquiry was held prior to passing of the Suspension Order, it is submitted that under Clause 22(a) (iii) (i.e. suspension without pay not exceeding 4 days), the detailed enquiry is not mandatory. In other words, the Certified Standing Orders do not warrant an enquiry to be conducted in cases of punishment under Clause 22(a) (iii) before awarding punishment provided reasonable opportunity in writing is given to the Workman to explain the charges. Hence, the Party II contented that the punishment proportionate to the act of misconduct committed by the Workman/Party I has been imposed upon him as the same is necessary as a measure of discipline which is the paramount importance in functioning and running of the affairs of the Party II/Company. The Workman at every step

has alleged that he has been the victim of unfair labour practice however, could not bring anything on record to substantiate the above fact, on the contrary the Party II by way of oral as well as documentary evidence could prove the charges levelled against the Workman and was also able to prove that the punishment imposed was not disproportionate to those charges of misconduct. Hence, the issue No. 1 and 3 are answered in the negative.

34. *Issue No. 2:* For the reasons discussed in the Issue No. 1 and 3, this Tribunal is of the opinion that the present reference is maintainable and therefore, this Issue stands answered in the negative.

Hence, the Order:

ORDER

- i. The Workman is not entitled for any relief.
- ii. No order as to cost.
- iii. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-

(Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
-Labour Court.

Notification

No. 28/02/2024-LAB/736

The following Award passed by the Industrial Tribunal and Labour Court, at Panaji-Goa on 14-11-2024 in Case Ref. No. Appln. 02/2014 is hereby published as required under Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amalia O. F. Pinto, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 05th December, 2024.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AND
LABOUR COURT
GOVERNMENT OF GOA
AT PANAJI

(Before *Mrs. Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar*, Hon'ble
Presiding Officer)

Appln. 02/2014

Mr. Rayu M. Phadte and 6 others,
Rep. by Gen. Secretary,

The Marmagao Waterfront Worker's
Union, Mukund Building, 2nd Floor,
P. O. Box No. 90,
Vasco Da Gama-Goa

..... Applicants/Party-I.

V/s

M/s Navdurga Shipping Pvt. Ltd.,
Through its Managing Director,
Madkaikar Apartment,
Ella, Old Goa,
Tiswadi, Goa

.... Opponent/Party II.

Workmen/Party I represented by Shri P. Gaonkar.

Employer/Party II represented by Learned Adv. Shri
K. Monteiro.

AWARD

**(Delivered on this the 14th day of the month of
November of the year 2024)**

The Applicants/Party I have filed this Application under Section 2A(2) seeking for adjudication of the existing dispute between the Management of M/s Navdurga Shipping Pvt. Ltd. and the Applicants/ /Party I in the matter of retrenchment of the services of the 7 workmen named hereinbelow.

2. In brief, it is the case of the Applicants/Party I that they were working with the Opponent/Party II, M/s. Navdurga Shipping Company Pvt. Ltd. All the 7 crew members were employed with the Opponent/ /Party II as per the following details:-

1. Mr. Rayu Maddu Phadte,
Designation Sukhani,
Date of joining 21-01-2006
2. Mr. Baburao Ramkrishna Naik,
Designation Engine Driver,
Date of joining 16-11-2006
3. Mr. Vijay Gangaram Naik,
Designation Master,
Date of joining 01-06-2010
4. Mr. Premanand Datta Fadte,
Designation Sukhani,
Date of joining 26-10-2005
5. Mr. Prashant Govind Korgaonkar,
Designation Oilman,
Date of joining 01-04-2006
6. Mr. Salahuddin Shafiq Khan,
Designation Master,
Date of joining 16-10-2008
7. Mr. Umesh Chandrakant Kundaikar,
Designation Sukhani,
Date of joining 01-07-2008.

3. The Applicants/Party I stated that the Opponent/Party II had employed a total of more than 50 Workmen/Barge Crew for the purpose of operating the 3 Barges in different designations such as Masters, Drivers, Sukani, Oilman and Sailors. All the crew members of the said 3 barges of the Opponent/Party II were entitled to wages as per the Settlement dated 09-02-2007 and that they were also entitled for other benefits such as Bonus, other Beneficial Allowances, ESIC benefits and Allowances, T.A, D.A, leave, Gratuity, Provident Fund, etc. All the crew members employed on 3 Barges of the Opponent/Party II were transferable from one Barge to another as per the exigencies of duty as determined by the Opponent/Party II from time to time. Accordingly, there was common seniority list designation wise of all the Barge crew members of the Opponent/Party II.

4. The Applicants/Party I stated that the Opponent/Party II had been paying the wages of the crew members initially in cash in their office at Old Goa, and later on by directly depositing the same in their respective salary accounts opened by the Opponent/Party. The barge workers working in Goa are covered by the settlements signed between the United Bargemen's Association and Association of the Barge Employer. As per the said settlement, the crews are required to work in two shifts in a month of 15 days on fifteen days off with 9 Barge Crew in each shift. As per the settlement dated 11-01-1985 at Exb. 29 if the Employer continued the barge crew to work for full month then such Barge crew is required to be paid over time @ 2.5 times of their normal wages.

5. The Applicants/Party I stated that the said 7 workers had raised a dispute about their illegal refusal of employment by writing to the Opponent/Party II on 08-10-2012, followed by their letter to the earlier Union (United Bargemen's Association) dated 20-11-2012. The said Union (United Bargemen's Association) raised industrial dispute with the Opponent/Party II by its letter dated 20-11-2012 the copy of which was also forwarded to the Assistant Labour Commissioner, Panaji. As there was no sign of settlement of the industrial dispute even after the failure of the conciliation, the 7 crew members wrote a joint letter dated 11-11-2013 addressed to the Opponent/Party II, with a copy to the Commissioner of Labour. The Office of the Commissioner of Labour closed the file since the industrial dispute under No. IRM/COM(56)2012, had been recorded failure on 19-08-2013. Meanwhile, on 14-08-2014, seven workers had resigned from the United Bargemen's Association and had joined Marmagoa Waterfront Workers Union.

6. The Applicants/Party I therefore prays that the application be allowed and all the seven workers be reinstated in their respective service with the Opponent/Party II with full back wages and other benefits.

7. The Opponent/Party II in the written statement filed at Exhibit 6 opposed the Application stating that the claim of the Applicants/Party I is unsustainable in law, baseless, flagrant abuse of process of law filed only to harass and blackmail the Opponent/Party II. On merits, it is stated that in the month of December, 2011, the mining business in the State crumbled on account of the restrictions imposed by the State Government and the objections raised by the activists, NGO's and the members of the public protesting the mining activity in the State of Goa. On account of the ban imposed by Hon'ble Supreme Court on transportation of Iron Ore resulted in closing of the business of the Opponent/Party II permanently. Operations of the barge "Annapurna" were closed from 28-01-2012 and the Barge "Purva" came to be closed from 20-07-2012 for the reasons stated above which were beyond the control of the Opponent/Party II.

8. The Opponent/Party II stated that the Applicants/Party I used to render their services to the Opponent/Party II occasionally as casual workers only in certain exigencies. They were hired by the Opponent/Party II temporarily, for purely casual nature of work, as and when the need arose. The Applicants/Party I were self-employed labourers, who used to work casually as and when the work was available for them. They worked not only with the Opponent/Party II but also with others who would be desirous of hiring their services. That, on having realized that the business of the Opponent/Party II had been closed permanently on account of the ban imposed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, they realized that there was no option than to discharge all their 29 employees by paying their legal dues and closing the business permanently. It is further stated that the dispute raised by the Applicants/Party I which was taken up for conciliation by the authority under the Industrial Disputes Act ended in failure which was followed by an order of reference dated 01-01-2014. The said reference came to be registered by this Tribunal as Ref. No. IT/02/2014. The Opponent/Party II states that by an Award dated 11-06-2014; this Tribunal was pleased to dispose off the reference on account of failure on the part of the Applicants/Party I to prosecute the reference.

9. It is submitted that the claim raised by the Applicants/Party I is totally fictitious, tainted with malice only to extract money from the Opponent/

/Party II and hence prayed that the application of the Applicants/Party I be dismissed.

10. Considering the Claim Statement of the Applicants/Party I, the Written Statement filed by the Opponent/Party II and the Rejoinder on behalf of the Applicants/Party I following issues were framed on 02-08-2016.

ISSUES

1. Whether the Applicant/Party I prove that they are the workmen of the Opponent/Party II as envisaged under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act?
2. Whether the Applicant/Party I proves that the Opponent illegally refused the employment/ wrongfully terminated their services?
3. Whether the Applicant/Party I proves that they are unemployed from the date of termination till date, except two workers?
4. Whether the Opponent/Party II proves that the business of transportation of iron ore was closed on account of ban imposed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court?
5. Whether the Opponent/Party II proves that the claim of the Applicant/Party I is barred by the principles of res-judicata?
6. Whether the Opponent/Party II proves that the application under Section 2-A (2) is not maintainable?
7. What Relief? What Award?

11. I have gone through the records i.e. the pleadings, the oral as well as documentary evidence adduced by both the Parties, the written synopsis filed as well as the oral arguments advanced by both the Parties and after considering the same my findings on the issues with reasons are as follows:

- Issue No. 1 : In the affirmative.
 Issue No. 2 : In the affirmative.
 Issue No. 3 : In the negative.
 Issue No. 4 : In the affirmative.
 Issue No. 5 : In the negative.
 Issue No. 6 : In the negative.
 Issue No. 7 : As per final order.

REASONS

12. Issue No. 1: The Opponent/Party II in the Written Statement stated that the dispute raised by the Applicants/Party I was taken up for conciliation before the authorities under the Industrial Disputes

Act. Pursuance to the conciliation which ended in failure, reference dated 01-01-2014 was forwarded to the Tribunal which came to be registered as reference No. IT/02/2014. According to the Opponent/Party II, the Tribunal was pleased to pass the Award dated 11-06-2014 whereby the said reference was disposed off on account of the failure of the Applicants/Party I to prosecute the reference. It is not the case of the Opponent/Party II that the said reference was dismissed on merits as the Applicants/Party I failed to prove that they are not the workmen of the Opponent/Party II as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act. It is also not the case of the Opponent/Party II that in the earlier references also they had raised the objection as regards the Applicants/Party I are not the 'workmen' within the ambit of the Industrial Disputes Act. On the contrary, the Opponent/Party II has placed reliance on the said award passed by the Hon'ble Tribunal in reference No. IT/02/2014 and has raised a specific defense. An issue to that effect has been framed on the ground that the claim of the Applicants/Party I is barred by the principle of res-judicata.

13. The Applicants/Party I on the other hand in their Claim Statement specifically pleaded the material ingredients to show that they have continuously worked for the Opponent/Party II as barge crew members in terms of the settlement dated 11-01-1985 at Exhibit 29. The Applicants/Party I has relied upon Exhibit 25 the service record of all the seven employees under the reference wherein the details regarding the name of the vessel they were working on, their date of commencement in services, the date of termination in service, net service, Y.M.D. and nature of duties in barge has been mentioned. Exhibit 26 in the bonafide certificate issued to one of the employees Umesh Chandrakant Kundaikar and Exhibit 27 is the service record of the employee Vijay Gangaram Naik.

14. The Opponent/Party II has not produced any document contrary to the document produced by the Applicants/Party I to prove that the Applicants/Party I are not the 'workmen'. The Opponent/Party II has contradicted in their own stand by pleading that the Applicants/Party I are not the workmen and on the other hand has relied upon the order passed by the Tribunal on reference which stated that there is the dispute between the Applicants/Party I as an employee and the Opponent/Party II as an Employer. Having proved this employer-employee relationship by the Party I, this Tribunal has no hesitation to answer this issue in favor of the Applicants/Party I in the affirmative.

15. *Issue No. 2:* The seven workmen who were employed with the Opponent/Party II are as follows:

1. Mr. Rayu Maddu Phadte,
Designation Sukhani,
Date of joining 11-01-2006
2. Mr. Baburao Ramkrishna Naik
Designation Engine Driver,
Date of joining 16-11-2006
3. Mr. Vijay Gangaram Naik,
Designation Master,
Date of joining 01-06-2010
4. Mr. Premanand Datta Fadte,
Designation Sukhani,
Date of joining 26-10-200
5. Mr. Prashant Govind Korgaonkar,
Designation Oilman,
Date of joining 01-04-2006
6. Mr. Salahuddin Shafiq Khan,
Designation Master,
Date of joining 16-10-2008
7. Mr. Umesh Chandrakant Kundaikar,
Designation Sukhani,
Date of joining 01-07-2008.

16. The services of these workmen were terminated/there was the refusal of employment to all this seven employees employed with the Opponent/Party II. Pursuance to that, the earlier Union to which these employees were associated raised dispute, the reference was forwarded to the Tribunal after the conciliation failure report, however, for non-appearance of the Applicants/Party I, the said reference was disposed off by Award dated 11-06-2014. In the meanwhile, all these seven employees resigned from the earlier Union and joined the new Union i.e. the Party I Union and persuaded their dispute by filing this present application under Section 2A (2) read with Section 36 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is the case of the Applicants/Party I that they have been illegally terminated from services without any valid reason. That they have not been issued any memo or show-cause notice or a charge-sheet nor there is any inquiry conducted prior to termination of their service.

17. The Opponent/Party II has taken a stand that on account of total ban of transportation of iron ore by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and they had to close down their business permanently and accordingly the operations of the Barge "Annapurna" was closed down on 28-01-2012 and that of Barge "Purva" was closed down from 20-07-2012. Prior to that, they had to close down the Operation of Barge "Durga" from 16-06-2011 on account of decline in the business and economically nonviable situations.

18. It is also not the case of the Applicants/Party I that the Opponent/Party II is still operating the said 3 barges, therefore, the inference has to be withdrawn that the business activity of the Opponent/Party II has been closed down on account of the mining ban laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Assuming that the services of all the seven workmen had to be terminated owing to the reasons stated hereinabove than the least that was required to be done by the Opponent/Party II was to comply with the provisions of Section 2F the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:

Section 2F:- No workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until:-

(a) the workman has been given one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the period of notice has expired, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of the notice;

(b) The workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be equivalent to fifteen days' average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and

(c) Notice in the prescribed manner is served on the appropriate Government or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government by notification in the Official Gazette.

19. It is therefore the contention of Shri P. Gaonkar for the Party I Union that M/s. Navdurga Shipping Company Pvt. Ltd., has not followed the mandate of Section 25F and therefore the termination from 17-12-2016 is illegal and void. In support of this contention, he has placed reliance in the case of **Deepali Gundu Surwase v/s Kranti Junior Adhyapak (2013) 10 SCC 324.**

20. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State Bank of India v/s Shri N. Sundara Money** held that Section 25F (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, provides that no workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year under an employer shall be retrenched by that employer until he has been paid at the time of the retrenchment compensation which shall be equivalent to 15 days average pay for every completed year of service or any part thereof in excess of six months. Section 2(o) of the Act defines 'retrenchment' as meaning the termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reasons whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action. In the "Hospital Mazdoor Sabha's the Supreme Court held that the statutory

requirement of the payment of compensation under Section 25F (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is a condition precedent for the retrenchment of a workman and any retrenchment without payment at the time of the retrenchment makes the retrenchment order invalid and inoperative.

21. It is the contention of the Opponent/Party II that on account of the ban imposed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, they closed down the operation of all the 3 barges and discharged all 29 employees by paying them legal dues in terms of the mutual settlement arrived between the employees and accordingly paid dues and discharged them from the services.

22. Dismissing the above contention, Shri P. Gaonkar submitted that though the Opponent/Party II claimed that they have paid all the legal dues to the workmen, however, not a single piece of evidence has been produced on record to substantiate their above statement. Further, the management's own witness Shri Vishnu Trivekar admitted that the Respondent was operating 3 barges and had employed 29 persons, however, did not know what work they were doing as he was not allocating them the duties. There is no documentary evidence produced on record that the Opponent/Party II have complied with all the ingredients of Section 25F prior to retrenching the services of all seven employees employed with the Opponent/Party II. Having failed to comply with the pre-requirements in terms of Section 25F of the Act by the Opponent/Party II, the termination of all the seven employees' amounts to illegal and wrongful termination of their services, hence Issue No. 2 stands answered in the affirmative.

23. *Issue No. 3: Workman*, Shri Umesh Chandrakant Kundaikar in his Affidavit-in-Evidence has stated that all the seven workmen are unemployed. The issue No. 3 reads

"whether the Applicant/Party I prove that they are unemployed from the date of termination till date, except two workers?"

24. Admittedly, this witness on oath has made a statement contrary to his own pleading. The issue since pertains to the unemployment of each employee therefore it assumes importance that each workman should have stepped in the witness box to prove their stand of unemployment which the Applicant/Party I workmen has failed, therefore for want of sufficient evidence on record this issue stands answered in negative.

25. *Issue No. 4: The Opponent/Party II* in their Written Statement has taken defence that on account of total ban of transportation of Iron Ore by the

Hon'ble Supreme Court they had to close down their business permanently and accordingly the operation of the Barge Annapurna was closed down on 28-01-2012 and that of Barge Purva was closed down from 20-07-2012. Prior to that, they had to close down the Operation of Barge Durga from 16-06-2011 on account of decline in the business and economically nonviable situations. The Applicants/Party I have not brought anything to the contrary to the stand taken by the Opponent/Party II to show that the barges are still in operation or that the Opponent/Party II continued with the operation of the barges post the same being banned by the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, as such there is no reason not to believe the Opponent/Party II of the closing down the business of transportation of Iron Ore on account of ban imposed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. For the reasons above, this issue stand answered in the affirmative.

26. *Issue No. 5: The present dispute* is in respect of the alleged illegal retrenchment of seven workmen. Since there was the refusal of employment to all this seven employees by the Opponent/Party II the earlier union (United bargemen's association raised the industrial dispute by its letter dated 20-11-2012 before the Assistant Labour Commissioner. Accordingly, the conciliation proceedings was initiated before the ALC and after considering the reply filed by the Management and considering the dispute raised by the Union, and as both the parties did not arrive at any settlement, the Conciliation Officer sent Failure Report. It is the contention of the Applicants that they did not receive any order of reference from the Government of Goa as such they approached the Tribunal with this application under Section 2A (2) read with Section 36 of the Industrial Disputes Act. The Opponent/Party II in the Written Statement as well as in the written submission filed by them has taken a stand that the Government of Goa had forwarded the reference No. 02/2014 to this Tribunal upon the failure report submitted by the Conciliation Officer however, for non-appearance of the Applicants/Party I, the said reference was disposed off by Award dated 11-06-2014. As against this, it is the contention of the Applicants/Party I that the Opponent/Party II had intentionally not given the address of the seven workmen for issuance of notices to them individually when the notice sent in the office of earlier union return unserved as the office of the union was found closed. The non-appearance of all seven workmen was because of the non-service of the notice on them. Again dismissing the contention of the Opponent/Party II about the present claim of the Applicants/Party I being barred by the principle of res-judicata on account of the Award passed in the earlier reference.

It is submitted that the said reference was not decided on merits as such the claim of the Applicants cannot be said to be barred by the principle of res-judicata. In support of its contention the Applicants/Party I relied upon in the case of ***Dalmia Dadri Cement v/s Avtar Naraian Gujral and ors.*** that “on the very principle of it, this decision can have application only where there is an adjudication by the Tribunal on the merits”. And therefore the res-judicata is not applicable in this case as the matter was not decided on merits.

27. The Opponent/Party II did not dislodge the above contention of the Applicants/Party I. Moreover, the Award on record speaks for itself that it is an ex-parte Award and not the one decided on the merits of the case. Therefore, this Tribunal can safely conclude that the Opponent/Party II has not proved this issue, the burden of which was on to them. Hence, the same is answered in the negative.

28. *Issue No. 6:* Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act reads as under: Notwithstanding anything contained in Section 10, any such workman as is specified in sub-section (1) may, make an application direct to the Labour Court or Tribunal for adjudication of the dispute referred to therein after the expiry of forty-five days from the date he has made the application to the Conciliation Officer of the appropriate Government for conciliation of the dispute, and in receipt of such application the Labour Court or Tribunal shall have powers and jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the dispute, as if it were a dispute referred to it by the appropriate Government in accordance with the provisions of this Act and all the provisions of this Act shall apply in relation to such adjudication as they apply in relation to an industrial dispute referred to it by the appropriate Government.

29. Thus Section 2A-(2) inserted in the statute by Act 24 of 2010 enables the workman to make an application directly to the Labour Court or Tribunal for adjudication of Industrial dispute after expiry of 45 days from the date of this Application to the Conciliation Officer of the appropriate Government for the conciliation of dispute within 3 years from the date of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment, otherwise termination of his services. The Opponent/Party II has not brought on record anything to suggest that the Applicants/Party I has not complied with the requirement with the Section 2A(2) so as to dismiss the same as not maintainable under Section 2A(2) of the Act. Hence, this issue too is answered against the Opponent/Party II in the negative.

30. The Applicants/Party I has submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court ordered closing of the mines

operation in the year, 2012. However, it was a temporary suspension of the mines and that none of the mine owners or barge owners had retrenched their workers and that the mining operations restarted in the year, 2016. However, there is no clear evidence brought on record by the Applicants/Party I to show that all the barges were operational in the year, 2016 and therefore, there is no question of relief of reinstatement that can be granted to all the seven workmen. The Applicants/Party I, however, has proved that the action of the Opponent/Party II to terminate their services was not in compliance with Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and that the Opponent/Party II also did not pay to all these seven workers their legal dues in terms of settlement dated 09-02-2007 at Exhibit 30 in view of that I pass the following Order.

Hence the following Award:

ORDER

1. The Management/Employer is directed to pay to all these seven workmen their legal dues i.e.
 - (i) The back wages, other benefits and consequential benefit/pay for the overtime.
 - (ii) To pay the overtime arrears for the period when the salaries were not paid in accordance with the terms of settlement dated 09-02-2007 at Exhibit 30.
 - (iii) To pay 10% interest on the overtime wages and other arrears.
 - (iv) To pay the cost of the Award.
- (2) Inform the Government accordingly

Sd/-

(Vijayalaxmi Shivolkar),
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
-Labour Court.



Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment) Division



Order

No. 14/23/2022-LD(Estt.)/79

Read: Order 14/06/2018-LD(Estt.) dated 15-01-2019.

Whereas, the Government has sanctioned the interim implementation of revised pay scales, as per the Order dated 21-12-2018 in Misc. Application No.

645/2018 in Stamp Number (Appln.) No. 3582 of 2016 and in accordance with the Annexure appended to the said Order. These interim arrangements were to remain in effect until the relevant rules are finalized, with pay scales fixed in accordance with the CCS (Revised) Pay Rules, 2016.

And whereas, the Registrar (Administration), High Court of Bombay at Goa, had requested for maintenance of pay scale parity across all benches of the Bombay High Court. The High Court of Bombay at Goa's employees had also filed Writ Petition No. 186 of 2023, seeking for directions to upgrade their pay scales on par with the pay scales of Maharashtra.

And whereas, pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Writ Petition No. 646/2023 dated 15-05-2023, the State of Goa notified the High Court of Bombay at Goa Officers and Members of the Staff on the Establishment (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 2023, on 03-06-2023.

The State Government on 22-06-2023 again notified the Amendment Rules, 2023, in order to remove discrepancies in the Rules notified on 03-06-2023.

Some retired employees of the High Court of Bombay at Goa filed I.A No. 234830 of 2023 before

Hon'ble High Court and also sought directions to the State of Goa to provide pay parity with that of the employees of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court and its Benches at Nagpur and Aurangabad.

And whereas, now the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa made a judgment on 30-07-2024, allowing Writ Petition No. 186 of 2023 and Writ Petition No. 409 of 2023, thereby directing the State Government to grant pay scales to the employees of the High Court of Bombay at Goa on par with those of the employees of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court and its Benches at Nagpur and Aurangabad.

The Government of Goa have accepted the Order dated 14-11-2024 in Writ Petition No. 464/2023 and pleased to implement the revised pay scales from the date indicated in the attached Annexure against the relevant posts.

This issues with the concurrence of Finance (R&C) Department vide U. O. No. 1400102806 dated 12-10-2024.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Amir Y. Parab, Under Secretary (Law-Estt.).

Porvorim, 8th January, 2025.

ANNEXURE

Sr. No.	Designation	Existing Pay Scale	Revised Pay Scale	Date from which to be made applicable
1	2	3	4	5
Secretarial Cadre Post				
1.	Senior Private Secretaries to Hon'ble Judges	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+GP 7600 (Level-12 Rs. 78800-209200)	Rs. 43690-1080-49090-1230-56470 (scale of Senior Civil Judge, ACP-I)	w.e.f. 01-10-2007
2.	Private Secretaries to the Hon'ble Judges	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+GP 6600 (Level-11 Rs. 67700-208700)	Rs. 15600-39100+Grade Pay Rs. 7900 (Pay Band-3) (S-26) Rs. 82200-211500)	w.e.f. 01-10-2007
3.	Personal Assistants to the Hon'ble Judges	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+GP Rs. 5400 (Level-10 Rs. 56100-177500)	Rs. 15600-39100+GP Rs. 6600 (PB-3 Level-11 Rs. 67700-208700)	w.e.f. 01-10-2007

Sr. No.	Designation	Existing Pay Scale	Revised Pay Scale	Date from which to be made applicable
1	2	3	4	5
Group "A" & "B" Posts				
1.	Assistant Registrar	PB-3 Rs.15600-39100+GP 6600 (Level-11 Rs. 67700-208700)	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+ Grade Pay Rs. 7900 (S-26) Rs. 82200-211500)	w.e.f. 01-04-2011
2.	Protocol Officer-cum-Court Keeper	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+GP 6600 (Level-11 Rs. 67700-208700)	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+ Grade Pay Rs. 7900 (S-26) Rs. 82200-211500)	w.e.f. 01-04-2011
3.	Librarian	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+GP 5400 (Level-10 Rs. 56100-177500)	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+ GP 6600 (Level-11 Rs. 67700-208700)	w.e.f. 01-04-2011
4.	Section Officer	PB-2 Rs. 9300-34800+GP 4600 (Level-7 Rs. 44900-142400)	PB-3 Rs. 15600-39100+ GP 5400 (Level-10) after 04 years of regular service Rs. 15600-39100+ GP 6600 (Level-11)	w.e.f. 01-04-2011

◆◆◆

Department of Planning

Directorate of Planning, Statistics & Evaluation

—

Addendum

No. DPSE/III/GIFT/120/2022-23/3265

Read: No. DPSE/III/GIFT/120/2022-23/2614 dated 18-01-2024.

In the above referred Notification after Sr. No. 9, the following line shall be inserted.

“10. Shri Charudutta Panigrahi — Member”
Adviser to Government

And Sr. No. 10 in above referred Notification may be read as Sr. No. 11.

The rest of the content of the above read Notification shall remain unchanged.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Vijay B. Saxena, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary.
Porvorim, 27th March, 2024.

Department of Public Health

—

Notification

No. 13/11/2018-I/PHD/23

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 33-F of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (Central Act No. 23 of 1940), the Government of Goa hereby appoints Smt. Sushmita D'souza, Junior Scientific Officer (Drugs), Directorate of Food and Drugs Administration, Government of Goa, as the Government Analyst in respect of Ayurvedic, Siddha and Unani Drugs for the whole of the State of Goa.

This Notification shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Dr. Pooja Madkaikar, Under Secretary (Health-II).
Porvorim, 2nd January, 2025.

◆◆◆

Department of Tribal Welfare

Directorate of Tribal Welfare

—

Order

No. 1-232-2024-25/ADMN/DTW/4611

Sub.: Constitution of the Committee for preparation of Draft Rules of the Goa Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

Government is pleased to constitute a committee under the Chairmanship of Chairperson of Goa Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes comprising of the following in order for preparation of Draft Rules of the Goa Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are as under:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Official/Members	Designation
1	2	3
1.	Shri Deepak Karmalkar, Chairperson of Goa Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes	Chairman.
2.	Adv. Upaso Gaunkar, R/o H. No. 191, Dessai Waddo, Quepem, Paroda-Goa	Member.
3.	Adv. Suresh Palkar, R/o Gurudaat Building, 2nd Floor, Near Jama Masjid, Ponda-Goa	Member.
4.	Shri Sudhir Volvoikar (Jt. Secretary), Law Department, Secretariat	Member.
5.	Shri Dasharath M. Redkar, Director of Tribal Welfare/Secretary/CEO of GCSCST	Member Secretary.

The Committee shall finalize the Draft Rules within a period of three months from the date of issuance of notification.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Dasharath M. Redkar, Director & ex officio Jt. Secretary (Tribal Welfare).

Panaji, 9th January, 2025.

Notification

No. DTW/AD(N)/2024-25/DAJGUA/CSS-291/4548

The Government of Goa is pleased to constitute the State Level Apex Committee (SLAC) under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs, New Delhi namely "Dharti Aaba Janjatiya Gram Utkarsh Abhiyan" (DA-JUGA) for the State of Goa consisting of the following members:

- | | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| 1. Chief Secretary, Goa | — | Chairman. |
| 2. Secretary (Tribal Welfare) | — | Convener. |
| 3. Secretary (Education) | — | Member. |
| 4. Secretary (Social Welfare) | — | Member. |
| 5. Secretary (Water Resources) | — | Member. |
| 6. Secretary (Public Works Department) | — | Member. |
| 7. Secretary (Health) | — | Member. |
| 8. Secretary (Women & Child Development) | — | Member. |
| 9. Secretary (Tourism) | — | Member |
| 10. Secretary (Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Services) | — | Member. |
| 11. Secretary (Fisheries) | — | Member. |
| 12. Secretary (Panchayat) | — | Member. |
| 13. Secretary (Agriculture) | — | Member. |
| 14. Secretary (Information Technology) | — | Member. |

- | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|
| 15. Secretary (Skill Development & Entrepreneurship) | — | Member. |
| 16. Secretary (New and Renewable Energy) | — | Member. |
| 17. Secretary (Electricity) | — | Member. |
| 18. Secretary (Rural Development) | — | Member. |
| 19. Director, Tribal Welfare | — | Member Secretary. |

The functions of the State Level Apex Committee are as follows:

- 1) The committee will assess the performance of line departments and District with regards to implementation of the scheme.
- 2) To review the proposals submitted by line departments and recognize the best performing department.
- 3) The committee shall meet once in the three months to assess the proposal prepared by the line departments to submit to their respective Central Ministries under Dharti Aaba Janjatiya Gram Utkarsh Abhiyan.

The Notification shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Dasharath M. Redkar, Director/ex officio Joint Secretary (TW).

Panaji, 7th January, 2025.

Pedne Taluka Sarkari Prathamik Shikshak Sahakari Path Sanstha Maryadit Pedne-Goa

ADEI Office Building, Surban Wada, Pernem-Goa-403512

FORM-24

(See Rule 111A)

Form for declaration of result

In pursuance of powers conferred by sub-section 6 of Section 66 of the Goa Co-op. Societies Act, 2001, I, declare the result of office bearers as follows.

Election of Office Bearer of the Pedne Taluka Sarkari Prathamik Shikshak Sahakari Path Saustha Maryadit Pedne-Goa.

Sr. No.	Name of the candidate	Address, contact number & e-mail ID of the candidate	For the post of
1.	Shri Shamba Rama Mayekar	H. No. 517-B1, Chichola, Dhargal, Pernem-Goa 8806561095 shambamayekar29@gmail.com	Chairman.
2.	Shri Gurudas Shantaram Shetkar	H. No. 35/2, Devulwada, Harmal, Pernem-Goa 9823647570 shetkar gurudas24@gmail.com	Vice-Chairman.
3.	Shri Narayan Vithal Sawant	Junaswada, Mandre, Pedne-Goa 9422394876 Nanamaster@gmail.com	Secretary.
4.	Shri Pramod Vaman Parab	Madhalawada, Varkhand, Pernem-Goa 8999749484 Pramodparab.@gmail.com	Treasurer.

Jeetendra K. Naik Gaonkar, Authorised person.

Mapusa, 1st January, 2025.

V. No. AP-1251/2025.

www.goaprintingpress.gov.in

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,
Government Printing Press,
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 22.00

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING PRESS, PANAJI-GOA—327/80—01/2025.